arXiv:1606.06924v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 22 Jun 2016

Self-consistent spin-wave analysis of the 1/3 magnetization plateau in the kagome antiferromagnet

Zhong-Chao Wei,[1] Hai-Jun Liao*,[1] Jing Chen,[1] Hai-Dong Xie,[1]
Zhi-Yuan Liu,[1] Zhi-Yuan Xie,[2] Wei Li,[3,4] Bruce Normand,[2] and Tao Xiang[1,5]

[1] *Institute of Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, P.O. Box 603, Beijing 100190, China*
[2] *Department of Physics, Renmin University of China, Beijing 100872, China*
[3] *Department of Physics, Key Laboratory of Micro-Nano Measurement-Manipulation and Physics (Ministry of Education), Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China*
[4] *International Research Institute of Multidisciplinary Science, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China*
[5] *Collaborative Innovation Center of Quantum Matter, Beijing 100190, China*

(Dated: June 23, 2016)

We propose a modified spin-wave theory to study the 1/3 magnetization plateau of the antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model on the kagome lattice. By the self-consistent inclusion of quantum corrections, the 1/3 plateau is stabilized over a broad range of magnetic fields for all spin quantum numbers, S. The values of the critical magnetic fields and the widths of the magnetization plateaus are fully consistent with recent numerical results from exact diagonalization and infinite projected entangled paired states.

PACS numbers: 75.10.Jm, 75.30.Ds, 75.30.Kz

The investigation of low-dimensional frustrated magnetism has become one of the most active frontiers in condensed matter physics. Current frontiers in the field include obtaining full insight into the entanglement structure of quantum many-body wavefunctions for different types of quantum spin liquid [1] and simplex-solid state [2]. Among the many different frustrated systems, quantum antiferromagnets on the kagome lattice are perhaps the most intriguing, because the combination of strong geometric frustration and weak constraints maximizes quantum fluctuation effects. The kagome antiferromagnet has attracted ever-increasing attention over the last two decades, with many different methods applied and resulting proposals for the nature of the ground state [3–6]. Many materials realizations of the kagome geoemtry have now been discovered, including volborthite ($Cu_3V_2O_7(OH)_2 \cdot 2H_2O$) [7], herbertsmithite ($ZnCu_3(OH)_6Cl_2$) [8], vesignieite ($BaCu_3(OH)_6Cl_2$) [9], $BaNi_3(OH)_2(VO_4)_2$ [10], $KV_3Ge_2O_9$ [11], and jarosites of several different metal ions including chromium ($KCr_3(OH)_6(SO_4)_2$) [12].

One of the characteristic features of kagome antiferromagnets is the appearance of magnetization plateaus in the presence of an external magnetic field. Irrespective of the method applied and the prediction for the zero-field ground state, all theoretical approaches agree that there exists a robust magnetization plateau at $m = 1/3$ for all values of the spin quantum number, S. The 1/3 plateau has been investigated theoretically by real-space perturbation theory (RSPT) [14], exact diagonalization (ED) [15, 16], density-matrix renormalization-group methods (DMRG) [17], and infinite projected entangled paired states (iPEPS) [18]. RSPT provides analytical results for the critical magnetic fields and the width of the plateau [14]. However, a qualitative discrepancy has arisen with recent numerical results from ED [15] and iPEPS [18], not least in that the calculated plateau width increases with increasing S, whereas it decreases within RSPT.



FIG. 1. The up-up-down spin configuration of the 1/3 magnetization plateau on the kagome lattice. The two primitive lattice vectors are denoted as $\vec{a}_1 = (1, 0)\, a$ and $\vec{a}_2 = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})\, a$, where we set $a = 1$. The unit cell, denoted by the dashed blue lines, contains the three sites (A, B, C). δ_1, δ_2, and δ_3 denote the nearest-neighbor lattice vectors.

To improve both qualitative and quantitative understanding of the 1/3 magnetization plateau in the kagome antiferromagnet, in this Letter we employ a self-consistent spin-wave theory to study its properties. The theory contains a single quantum correction parameter, determined self-consistently from the expectation values of the magnon densities. We compute these densities for all S, derive the spin-wave spectrum, and evaluate both the critical magnetic fields and the width of the 1/3 plateau, finding complete consistency with the recent numerical results.

We study the Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j - h \sum_i S_i^z, \qquad (1)$$

where $\vec{S}_i$ is the spin-S operator on site i, $\langle i,j\rangle$ denotes the sum over neighboring sites, and J, the nearest-neighbor antiferromagnetic exchange coupling, is set as the energy scale ($J=1$). Recent numerical studies of the kagome and Husimi lattices by the method of projected entangled simplex states (PESS) [6] have demonstrated very explicitly [13] that the origin of the 1/3-plateau phase is the creation of a semiclassical up-up-down spin configuration on every triangle, as shown in Fig. 1; we stress that this statement holds for all values of S, even $S=1/2$. As a consequence, it is entirely justified to employ a spin-wave description, which we implement by performing a Holstein-Primakoff transformation from spin operators to bosonic degrees of freedom,

$$S_i^+ = \sqrt{2S - d_i^\dagger d_i}\, d_i,\;\; S_i^z = S - d_i^\dagger d_i,\; i\in A,B, \tag{2}$$

$$S_i^+ = -d_i^\dagger \sqrt{2S - d_i^\dagger d_i},\;\; S_i^z = d_i^\dagger d_i - S,\; i\in C. \tag{3}$$

Here we have assumed that spins on the A and B sublattices are oriented along $\hat{z}$, whereas those on the C sublattice are oriented along $-\hat{z}$. We restrict all of our considerations to zero temperature.

In a conventional linear spin-wave theory ($S\to\infty$), the 1/3 plateau is stable only at $h=2S$. However, the effects of quantum fluctuations at finite S may be included through the effective mean-field boson densities at each site, $n_i \equiv \langle d_i^\dagger d_i\rangle$, which are determined self-consistently and act to stabilize the magnetization plateau over a finite range of h. By introducing the approximation

$$\sqrt{2S - d_i^\dagger d_i} \approx \sqrt{2S - \langle d_i^\dagger d_i\rangle} = \sqrt{2S - n_i}, \tag{4}$$

the Hamiltonian (1) can be decoupled in the form

$$\mathcal{H}_{\rm MF} = \sum_k \alpha_k^\dagger \left[\mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{k}) + \delta h \Lambda\right] \alpha_k + \mathcal{C}, \tag{5}$$

where $\alpha_k \equiv (a_k, b_k, c_{-k}^\dagger)^T$, a_k, b_k, and c_k are the Fourier transforms of the operators, d_i, for each of the A, B, and C sublattices, $\delta h = (h-2S)$, $\Lambda = \mathrm{diag}(1,1,-1)$, and $\mathcal{C}$ is a constant. $\mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{k})$ specifies the quadratic Hamiltonian at $h=2S$,

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}(\boldsymbol{k}) = \begin{pmatrix} 2S & d_k & f_k \\ d_k & 2S & g_k \\ f_k & g_k & 2S \end{pmatrix},$$

in which

$$\begin{aligned} d_k &= \sqrt{(2S-n_A)(2S-n_B)}\,\cos(\boldsymbol{k}\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta_1}),\\ f_k &= -\sqrt{(2S-n_A)(2S-n_C)}\,\cos(\boldsymbol{k}\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta_2}),\\ g_k &= -\sqrt{(2S-n_B)(2S-n_C)}\,\cos(\boldsymbol{k}\cdot\boldsymbol{\delta_3}), \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

with the bond vectors δ_i as shown in Fig. 1.

In Eq. (7), n_A, n_B, and n_C are respectively the expectation values of the magnon density, $\langle d_i^\dagger d_i\rangle$, on each of the A, B, and C sublattices. From the Holstein-Primakoff transformation, the normalized longitudinal magnetizations on the three sublattices are $m_A = 1 - n_A/S$, $m_B = 1 - n_B/S$, and $m_C = n_C/S - 1$. In the 1/3-plateau phase, by definition $(m_A + m_B + m_C)/3 = 1/3$ and therefore $n_A + n_B = n_C$. Further, here and henceforth we employ the reflection symmetry of the system about a vertical axis through the C sites [Fig. 1], which specifies that $m_A = m_B$ and $n_A = n_B$. Thus the self-consistent spin-wave theory for the 1/3-plateau phase contains only one parameter to be determined, which we denote as $x = n_A = n_B = n_C/2$.

The diagonalization of a general quadratic bosonic Hamiltonian is nontrival. Here we summarize the procedure [19] to diagonalize the mean-field Hamiltonian of Eq. (5). In the generalized Bogoliubov transformation

$$\alpha_k = U_k \beta_k, \tag{7}$$

the commutation relations of the new bosons, $\beta_k \equiv (\beta_{1,k}, \beta_{2,k}, \beta_{3,-k}^\dagger)^T$, are preserved if U_k satisfies the condition

$$U_k^\dagger \Lambda U_k = U_k \Lambda U_k^\dagger = \Lambda. \tag{8}$$

By substituting Eq. (7) back into Eq. (5) and making use of the condition (8), one obtains

$$\mathcal{H}_{MF} = \sum_k \beta_k^\dagger \left[U_k^\dagger \mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{k}) U_k + \delta h \Lambda\right] \beta_k + \mathcal{C}. \tag{9}$$

To obtain a diagonal form, U_k must satisfy the further condition

$$U_k^\dagger \mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{k}) U_k = D_k = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1(\boldsymbol{k}), \lambda_2(\boldsymbol{k}), \lambda_3(\boldsymbol{k})), \tag{10}$$

where the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_n(\boldsymbol{k})\}$, which are the spin-wave dispersion relations at $h=2S$, should be positive definite, i.e. $\lambda_n(\boldsymbol{k}) > 0$. This requires that the matrix $\mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{k})$ also be positive definite [19], in which case there exists a matrix, K, such that $\mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{k}) = K^\dagger K$ (Cholesky decomposition or eigendecomposition of $\mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{k})$). The diagonalization of $\mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{k})$ therefore maps to the diagonalization of $K\Lambda K^\dagger$, meaning to the exercise of finding a further unitary matrix, V, such that $V^\dagger(K\Lambda K^\dagger)V = L$, with L diagonal. The solutions satisfying the two conditions (8) and (10) simultaneously are then $D_k = \Lambda L$ and $U_k = K^{-1} V D_k^{1/2}$. U_k may in fact be obtained directly by diagonalizing the matrix $\Lambda\mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{k})$, i.e. from the equation $(\Lambda\mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{k}))U_k = U_k(\Lambda D_k)$.

It is important to note that, due to Eq. (8), the generalized Bogoliubov transformation matrix, U_k, is independent of the magnetic field, h. Thus the energies of the spin-wave excitations at fields away from $h=2S$ are obtained simply by uniform shifts of the three magnon modes at $h=2S$,

$$\omega_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{k}) = \lambda_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{k}) + \delta h, \quad \omega_3(\boldsymbol{k}) = \lambda_3(\boldsymbol{k}) - \delta h, \tag{11}$$

whence the mean-field Hamiltonian (5) can be rewritten

$$\mathcal{H}_{MF} = \sum_k \sum_{j=1}^{3} \omega_j(\boldsymbol{k}) \beta_{j,k}^\dagger \beta_{j,k} + \mathcal{C}. \tag{12}$$



FIG. 2. Dispersion relations of the three elementary magnon excitations, $j = 1$, 2, and 3, for selected symmetry directions in the first Brillouin zone (inset), illustrated for field $h = 2S$ and $S = 1/2$. Δ_1 and Δ_3 denote respectively the energy gaps of modes 1 and 3.

In order to show the spin-wave dispersion relations, $\omega_j(\boldsymbol{k})$, it is necessary to solve for x. However, some preliminary remarks on the nature of the 1/3-plateau phase are already in order. It is clear from Eq. (11) that modes $\omega_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{k})$ are pushed up by an increase of the magnetic field while mode $\omega_3(\boldsymbol{k})$ is pushed down, and conversely when h decreases. When the lowest mode touches energy zero, the plateau phase becomes unstable. Thus the lower transition point, h_{c1}, out of the 1/3-plateau phase is determined by the lower gap of two modes $\lambda_{1,2}(\boldsymbol{k})$, whereas the upper transition, h_{c2}, is determined by the gap of $\lambda_3(\boldsymbol{k})$. Defining $\Delta_j = \min(\lambda_j(\boldsymbol{k}))$ as the energy gaps of the three spin-wave branches at field $h = 2S$,

$$h_{c1} = 2S - \min(\Delta_1, \Delta_2), \quad h_{c2} = 2S + \Delta_3, \tag{13}$$

and the width of the plateau is given by

$$\Delta_w = h_{c2} - h_{c1} = \min(\Delta_1, \Delta_2) + \Delta_3. \tag{14}$$

To determine the magnon-density parameter, x, we use a numerical iterative method to solve the equation

$$x = \frac{1}{N}\sum_k |U_k(1,3)|^2\,, \tag{15}$$

where U_k is the Bogoliubov transformation matrix of Eq. (7), which depends in turn on x. Because U_k does not depend on the magnetic field, x is also independent of h in the 1/3-plateau phase, although it does depend on S. As noted above, we need therefore solve Eq. (15) only at $h = 2S$ to obtain the spin-wave spectra, $\{\omega_j(\boldsymbol{k})\}$, and hence the critical fields h_{c1} and h_{c2} (13).

The spin-wave spectra for the $S = 1/2$ case at field $h = 2S$ are shown in Fig. 2. The minima of the two lower modes, $j = 1$ and 3, are both located at the Γ point ($\boldsymbol{k} = \boldsymbol{0}$). There are two trivial level-crossings between these modes, occurring at the points marked P_1 and P_2 in Fig. 2 but actually forming a circle in the Brillouin zone, which changes size with δh. However, the crossing between modes $j = 1$ and 2, which have the same δh-dependence, occurs at a single point, P_3, along the line ΓX. This nontrivial exact crossing is a consequence of the reflection symmetry through the $\hat{y}$-axis and leads to a Dirac-type spectrum between the eigenmodes $j = 1$ and 2. In more detail, the magnon spectra along ΓX can be found analytically by diagonalizing the matrix $\Lambda\mathcal{H}(\boldsymbol{k} = (k_x, 0))$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_1(k_x) &= \begin{cases} 2S - (2S-x)\cos(k_x/2), & k_x \le k_c \\ \frac{1}{2}[\sqrt{\gamma_k} + (2S-x)\cos(k_x/2)], & k_x > k_c \end{cases} \\
\lambda_2(k_x) &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}[\sqrt{\gamma_k} + (2S-x)\cos(k_x/2)], & k_x \le k_c \\ 2S - (2S-x)\cos(k_x/2), & k_x > k_c \end{cases} \\
\lambda_3(k_x) &= \tfrac{1}{2}[\sqrt{\gamma_k} - (2S-x)\cos(k_x/2)],
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

with $\gamma_k = [(2S - x)\cos(k_x/2) + 4x]^2 + 24x(S - x)$. The crossing point is therefore located at momentum $k_x = k_c = 2\cos^{-1}\left(\frac{3+x/S-\sqrt{1+18(x/S)-3(x/S)^2}}{4-2(x/S)}\right)$. In the classical limit, $S \to \infty$, the position of crossing is $k_c = 2\pi/3$. The gaps of modes 1 and 3 are

$$\Delta_1 = x, \quad \Delta_3 = \frac{x}{2} - S + \sqrt{S^2 + 9Sx - \frac{15}{4}x^2}, \tag{17}$$

and hence the normalized critical magnetic fields and the width of the 1/3 plateau are

$$\frac{h_{c1}}{S} = 2 - \frac{x}{S}, \tag{18}$$

$$\frac{h_{c2}}{S} = 2 - \left(1 - \frac{x}{2S}\right) + \sqrt{1 + 9\left(\frac{x}{S}\right) - \frac{15}{4}\left(\frac{x}{S}\right)^2}, \tag{19}$$

$$\frac{\Delta_w}{S} = \frac{3}{2}\left(\frac{x}{S}\right) - 1 + \sqrt{1 + 9\left(\frac{x}{S}\right) - \frac{15}{4}\left(\frac{x}{S}\right)^2}. \tag{20}$$

Concerning the form of the magnon-density function, $x(S)$, in Fig. 3 we show the quantity x/S determined numerically by solving the self-consistent equation (15). It is clear that x/S grows sub-linearly from zero, and similarly that $m_A = m_B = 1 - x/S$ (inset, Fig. 3) falls monotonically from full polarization in the classical limit. We propose the power-law form

$$m_A = m_B = \frac{1}{1 + \mu(1/S)^\eta} \tag{21}$$

for the sublattice magnetization and thus

$$\frac{x}{S} = \frac{\mu(1/S)^\eta}{1 + \mu(1/S)^\eta} = \frac{1}{1 + \mu^{-1}S^\eta} \tag{22}$$

for the magnon density. We find that this two-parameter fit, with prefactor $\mu = 0.206(1)$ and exponent $\eta = 0.690(1)$, offers an excellent account of the data over the entire range of S, i.e. not only where $1/S$ is small but



FIG. 3. Self-consistent magnon-density parameter, x/S, shown as a function of $1/S$. The red line indicates a two-parameter power-law fit of the form $x/S = \mu(1/S)^\eta/[1 + \mu(1/S)^\eta]$ [Eq. (22)]. The inset shows the magnitudes of the normalized magnetization on the A and B sublattices, with the result $m_A = m_B = 1 - x/S$ from the self-consistent spin-wave analysis shown as the solid red line and the corresponding results from iPEPS calculations with bond dimension $D = 10$ [18] shown as square blue points.



FIG. 4. (a) Normalized critical magnetic fields, h_{c1}/S and h_{c2}/S, of the 1/3-plateau phase, shown as functions of $1/S$. Data from the self-consistent spin-wave theory (solid red lines) are compared with results from ED (green) [15], iPEPS with bond dimension $D = 10$ (blue) [18], and RSPT (dashed black) [14]; (b) Width $\Delta_w = (h_{c2} - h_{c1})$ of the 1/3 plateau, shown as a function of $1/S$; all data labels as in panel (a). The inset shows the normalized width, Δ_w/S.

even when $S = 1/2$ (last point). We comment that significantly better statistics still can be obtained by generalizing this type of power-law fit to two exponents.

Returning to Eqs. (18) to (20), the nonzero boson-density expectation values on all sites ($n_A = n_B = n_C/2 = x$) lead to finite energy gaps [Eq. (17)], which stabilize the 1/3 plateau over a broad range of magnetic fields, as shown in Fig. 4 for all values of S. In the self-consistent spin-wave treatment, all of these quantities increase with the spin quantum number, S, although their normalized values decrease towards the expected limits (Figs. 3 and 4). This type of behavior is completely consistent with the numerical results obtained from ED [15] and iPEPS [18], which are shown for comparison in Fig. 4. The $1/S$-dependence of both critical fields, h_{c1} and h_{c2}, and of the plateau width, Δ_w, predicted by the self-consistent spin-wave theory have the correct qualitative trends, and in fact close quantitative agreement with the numerical calculations. It is striking that our analytical results are accurate at a semi-quantitative level even for the extreme quantum case, $S = 1/2$. These results demonstrate that the self-consistent spin-wave theory captures properly the nature of the 1/3 magnetization plateau in the kagome antiferromagnet.

By contrast, in the RSPT approach [14] one performs an expansion in powers of $1/S$ to obtain the plateau properties in the form

$$h_{c1}/S = 2 - \frac{1}{8S} - \frac{1}{4S^2}, \tag{23}$$

$$h_{c2}/S = 2 + \frac{3}{8S} + \frac{1}{4S^2}, \tag{24}$$

$$\Delta_w/S = \frac{1}{2S} + \frac{1}{2S^2}, \tag{25}$$

to order $(1/S)^2$. However, not only is this form fated to diverge in the most quantum systems, as $1/S \to 1$, but there is also a qualitative discrepancy with our analytical results and with the recent numerical results: the RSPT predictions for h_{c1} and h_{c2} are concave up as functions of $1/S$ where they should be concave down, and conversely, while the non-normalized plateau width trends in the wrong direction. Thus only in the extreme classical limit do the considerations of RSPT appear to be valid.

In summary, we have investigated the 1/3 magnetization plateau of the kagome antiferromagnet by using

a straightforward modified spin-wave theory, which contains only one self-consistent parameter. We have shown that the quantum corrections contained in this magnon-density parameter open finite energy gaps, which stabilize the 1/3-plateau phase over a broad range of magnetic fields. The qualitative and quantitative behavior of the critical fields and plateau widths is in excellent agreement with the recent numerical results for the same quantities obtained by exact diagonalization [15] and by tensor-network methods [18]. These results indicate that the self-consistent spin-wave theory provides an accurate description of the properties of the magnetization plateau in the kagome antiferromagnet. We suggest that the same type of theory should also be applied to describe the properties of magnetization plateaus in a number of other frustrated systems, including the extended square and honeycomb geometries as well as the triangular [20], checkerboard, Shastry-Sutherland, and Husimi antiferromagnets [13].

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 10934008, 10874215, and 11174365) and by the National Basic Research Program of China (Grant Nos. 2012CB921704 and 2011CB309703).

[1] Anderson P W 1973 Mater. Res. Bull. **8**, 153 ; Balents L 2010 Nature **464**, 199
[2] Arovas D P 2008 Phys. Rev. B **77**, 104404
[3] Zeng C and Elser V 1990 Phys. Rev. B **42**, 8436; Marston J B and Zeng C 1991 J. Appl. Phys. **69**, 5962; Nikolic P and Senthil T 2003 Phys. Rev. B **68**, 214415; Singh R R P and Huse D A 2007 Phys. Rev. B **76**, 180407; Singh R R P and Huse D A 2008 Phys. Rev. B **77**, 144415; Evenbly G and Vidal G 2010 Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 187203; Iqbal Y, Becca F and Poilblanc D 2011 Phys. Rev. B **83**, 100404
[4] Sachdev S 1992 Phys. Rev. B **45**, 12377; Jiang H C, Weng Z Y and Sheng D N 2008 Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 117203; Yan S, Huse D A and White S R 2011 Science **332**, 1173; Depenbrock S, McCulloch I P and Schollwöck U 2012 Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 067201; Jiang H C, Wang Z H and Balents L 2012 Nat. Phys. **8**, 902; Li T 2016 arXiv:1601.02165v1[cond-mat.str-el]
[5] Ran Y, Hermele M, Lee P A and Wen X G 2007 Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 117205; Iqbal Y, Becca F, Sorella S and Poilblanc D 2013 Phys. Rev. B **87**, 060405
[6] Xie Z Y, Chen J, Yu J F, Kong X, Normand B and Xiang T 2014 Phys. Rev. X **4**, 011025
[7] Hiroi Z, Hanawa M, Kobayashi N, Nohara M, Takagi H, Kato Y and Takigawa M 2001 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **70**, 3377
[8] Shores M P, Nytko E A, Barlett B M and Nocera D G 2005 J. Am. Chem. Soc. **127**, 13462
[9] Okamoto Y, Yoshida H and Hiroi Z 2009 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **78**, 033701; Okamoto Y, Tokunaga M, Yoshida H, Matsuo A, Kindo K and Hiroi Z 2011 Phys. Rev. B **83**, 180407
[10] Freedman D E, Chisnell R, McQueen T M, Lee Y S, Payen C and Nocera D G 2012 Chem. Commun., **48**:64-66
[11] Hara S, Sato H and Narumi Y 2012 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **81**, 073707
[12] Okuta K, Hara S, Sato H, Narumi Y and Kindo K 2011 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **80**(6):063703
[13] Liao H J, Xie Z Y, Chen J, Han X J, Xie H D, Normand B and Xiang T 2016 Phys. Rev. B **93**, 075154
[14] Zhitomirsky M E 2015 J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. **592**, 012110
[15] Nakano H and Sakai T 2015 J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **84**, 063705
[16] Capponi S, Derzhko O, Honecker A, Läuchli A M and Richter J 2013 Phys. Rev. B **88**, 144416
[17] Nishimoto S, Shibata N and Hotta C 2013 Nat. Commun. **4**, 2287
[18] Picot T, Ziegler M, Orús R and Poilblanc D 2016 Phys. Rev. B **93**, 060407(R)
[19] Messio L, Lhuillier C and Misguich G 2013 Phys. Rev. B **87**, 125127; Colpa J H P 1978 Phys. A (Amsterdam, Neth.) **93**, 327
[20] Takano J, Tsunetsugu H and Zhitomirsky M E 2011 J. Phys.: Conf. Series **320**, 012011